

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 20, 29, 30, and 33-47 are currently pending and stand rejected. Claims 29 and 30 are amended, claims 1-11, 20, and 33-47 are canceled, and claims 48-71 are added. Claims 29, 30, and 48-71 are pending upon entry of this amendment.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(b) in View of Nguyen

In paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 33, 34, 36, 44, and 45 under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,797,089 ("Nguyen"). Because claims 33, 34, 36, 44, and 45 are hereby canceled, this rejection is moot.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103 in View of Nguyen and Boesen

In paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 7-11, 20, 29, 30, 35, 37-43, and 46 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nguyen in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0027121 A1 ("Boesen"). Claims 1, 2, 7-11, 20, 35, 37-43, and 46 are hereby canceled, and their rejection is moot. Rejection of claims 29 and 30 is traversed.

Claim 29 as amended recites:

A handheld computing device comprising:

a base;

a processor, for executing software instructions on the device;

a memory, for storing software instructions to be executed by the processor;

a plurality of applications stored in the memory,

a lid, coupled to the base, for activating the device when opened, and causing the processor to execute a first application stored in the memory; and

a power button, coupled to the base, for when the lid is closed activating the device when pressed, and causing the processor to execute a second application stored in the memory.

Thus, claim 29 as amended recites a handheld computing device including a lid and a power button. Responsive to the lid being opened, the device is activated and a first application is executed. Responsive to the power button being pressed and the lid being closed, the device is activated and a second application is executed. Thus, when the device is off, a user can choose to activate it and execute the first application (e.g., a telephone application) by opening the lid, or to activate it and execute the second application (e.g., a calendar application) by activating the power button. Claim 30 as amended recites similar limitations.

The cited references, Nguyen and Boesen, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the claimed invention. Nguyen, among other differences, does not disclose “a lid, coupled to the base, for activating the device when opened, and causing the processor to execute a first application stored in the memory; and a power button, coupled to the base, for when the lid is closed activating the device when pressed, and causing the processor to execute a second application stored in the memory.”

Nguyen discloses a device including two parts hingedly connected together. The device includes a PDA unit and a telephone unit, each can be turned on or off by the user. When the two parts of the device are opened, the device determines

whether the two units are already turned on, and enables functions related to the unit that is turned on. This is different from activating the device in response to opening the two parts. See Nguyen, col. 7, lines 12-21.

The Examiner cited col. 6, lines 58 to col. 7, line 3 of Nguyen as support for the teaching of “a lid, coupled to the base, for activating the device when opened, and causing the processor to execute a first application stored in the memory.” However, the cited section merely teaches a portion of a process for a personal communications terminal (PCT) to select a mode of operation. As illustrated in FIG. 4 and col. 6, lines 45-57 of Nguyen, the PCT conducts the selection process independent of whether it is in an open position (see step 62 of FIG. 4). In addition, the PCT does not turn on its telephone unit or PDA unit during the selection process. Therefore, Nguyen fails to teach the claimed feature of “activating the device when [the lid is] opened” in claim 29. Furthermore, in Nguyen there is no activating a device when a power button is pressed and causing a processor of the device to execute a second application. Thus, Nguyen fails to disclose the above cited claim features.

Boesen similarly fails to disclose the claim features recited in claim 29. Boesen discloses a personal electronic device with keypad and additional functional keys. See Boesen, col. 2, paragraph 0043. Boesen does not disclose activating the personal electronic device and executing a first application responsive to a lid being opened. The Examiner cited Figs. 6 and 9 and paragraph [0043] lines 4-11 and paragraph [0052] of Boesen for teaching of activating the personal electronic device and executing a second application responsive to a power button being pressed and the

lid being closed. The cited figures and sections only show that the device has some functional keys accessible when the lid is closed. This is different from the claimed feature of a power button configured to activate the device and execute a second application responsive to a power button being pressed when the lid is closed. Thus, whether taken alone or in combination, Nguyen and Boesen fail to disclose the claimed invention as recited in claims 29 and 30 for at least the above reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103 in View of Nguyen, Boesen, and
Takahashi**

In pages 11 through 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-6 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nguyen in view of Boesen and U.S. Patent No. 6,662,244 ("Takahashi"). Because claims 3-6 are hereby canceled, this rejection is moot.

Conclusion

Applicants have added new claims 48-71 for which Applicants request consideration and examination. Applicants respectfully submit that these are supported by the specification and are commensurate within the scope of protection to which Applicants believe they are entitled.

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 29, 30, and 48-71, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss the above amendments or if the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants' representative would help to advance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeffrey C. Hawkins et al.

Dated: October 17, 2007

By: /Jie Zhang/
Jie Zhang, Reg. No. 60,242
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7194
Fax: (650) 938-5200